



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

VISTA HOSPITAL OF DALLAS
4301 VISTA ROAD
PASADENA, TX 77504

DWC Claim #:

Injured Employee:

Date of Injury:

Employer Name:

Insurance Carrier #:

Respondent Name

FEDERATED MUTUAL INSURANCE CO

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

01

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-07-8009-01

MFDR Date Received

July 31, 2007

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated July 23, 2007: "Carrier may reimburse at a 'per diem' rate for the hospital services if the total audited charges for the entire admission are below \$40,000, after the Carrier audits the bill pursuant to the applicable rules. However, if the total audited charges for the entire admission are above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the Stop-Loss Methodology in accordance with the plain language of the rule contained in § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(iii). This rule does not require a hospital to prove that services provided during the admission were unusually extensive or unusually costly to trigger the application of the Stop Loss Methodology. It is presumed that the services provided were unusually extensive or unusually costly when the \$40,000 stop-loss threshold is reached."

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated October 28, 2011: "Please allow this letter to serve as a supplemental statement to Vista's originally submitted request for dispute resolution in consideration of the Texas Third Court of Appeal's Final Judgment..."

Amount in Dispute: \$100,452.93

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated August 27, 2007: "The Commission has held that in order for the stop-loss provision to apply, the Provider must demonstrate that the procedure was both unusually extensive and unusually expensive. The Provider herein has not met the \$40,000.00 stop-loss threshold and therefore is not entitled to reimbursement under the stop-loss provisions. Even assuming, without admitting that the stop-loss threshold has been met, the Provider has not documented that the procedure as unusually extensive or unusually expensive. Therefore, the Provider has not shown itself to be entitled to additional reimbursement."

Response Submitted by: Parker & Assoc For Federated Mut Ins, 7600 Chevy Chase DR Ste 350, Austin, TX 78752

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated November 14, 2011: "The Stop-Loss exception to the per diem reimbursement methodology does not apply to this admission, and the purpose of the Stop-Loss

exception is not met by providing additional reimbursement over and above the per diem methodology based in part on abusive mark-up of the implantable to increase the profit margin on this procedure. This does not achieve effective medical cost control within the statutory requirements of Texas Labor Code Section 413.011(d). The Provide should not be rewarded for their abuse in the system.”

Response Submitted by: Parker & Associates, L.L.C., 7600 Chevy Chase Dr, Suite 350, Austin, TX 78752

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
March 02, 2007 through March 05, 2007	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$100,452.93	\$2,343.61

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.240, 31 *Texas Register* 3544, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the procedures for medical payments and denials.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.2, 31 *Texas Register* 3544, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the definition of final action.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to requests filed on or after January 15, 2007, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- 16 – Claim service lacks information which is needed for adjudication. Additional information is supplied using remittance advice remarks codes whenever appropriate.
- 270 – No allowance has been recommended for this procedure service supply.
- W1 – Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment
- 240 – Preauthorization not obtained 2 day inpatient stay was authorized 3rd day inpatient days is not allowed invoice for 16 implant charges received not trauma, no complications charges paid a per diem implants paid at invoice amount – 10 % per nurse review RU.
- 62 – Payment denied reduced for absence of or exceeded pre-certification/authorization.

Issues

1. Did the respondent provide sufficient explanation for denial of the disputed services?
2. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
4. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
5. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above

was issued on January 19, 2011. Each party was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date is considered. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.240(a) and (e), 31 Texas Register 3544, effective May 2, 2006 and applicable to the dates of service, state, in pertinent part, that "(a) An insurance carrier shall take final action after conducting bill review on a complete medical bill..." and "(e) The insurance carrier shall send the explanation of benefits in the form and manner prescribed by the Division..." Furthermore, 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.2, 31 Texas Register 3544, states, in pertinent part "(4) Final action on a medical bill-- (A) sending a payment that makes the total reimbursement for that bill a fair and reasonable reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement); and/or (B) denying a charge on the medical bill."

The requestor in its position statement asserts that:

"The Carrier did not make a legal denial of reimbursement because Vista was not provided with a sufficient explanation or the proper denial reasons to justify the denial of reimbursement of the disputed charges. In addition, the carrier applied the incorrect reimbursement methodology to Vista's charges."

Review of the submitted documentation finds that the explanation of benefits was issued using the division prescribed form TWCC 62 and noted payment exception codes of:

- 16 – Claim service lacks information which is needed for adjudication. Additional information is supplied using remittance advice remarks codes whenever appropriate.
- 270 – No allowance has been recommended for this procedure service supply.
- W1 – Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment
- 240 – Preauthorization not obtained 2 day inpatient stay was authorized 3rd day inpatient days is not allowed invoice for 16 implant charges received not trauma, no complications charges paid a per diem implants paid at invoice amount – 10 % per nurse review RU.
- 62 – Payment denied reduced for absence of or exceeded pre-certification/authorization.

These payment exception codes and descriptions support an explanation for the reduction of reimbursement based on former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. These reasons support a reduction of the reimbursement amount from the requested stop-loss exception payment reimbursement methodology to the standard per diem methodology amount and provided sufficient explanation to allow the provider to understand the reason(s) for the insurance carrier's action(s) for the services in dispute. The Division therefore concludes that the insurance carrier has met the requirements of applicable §133.240, and §133.2

2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
3. The requestor in its original position statement asserts that "...if the total audited charges for *the* entire admission are above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the Stop-Loss Methodology in accordance with the plain language of the rule contained in § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(iii). The rule does not require a hospital to prove that services provided during the admission were unusually extensive or unusually costly to trigger the application of the Stop Loss Methodology. It is presumed that the services provided were unusually extensive or unusually costly when the \$40,000 stop-loss threshold is reached." As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) rendered judgment to the contrary. In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts' final judgment and opined on both rule requirements. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually extensive services. Rule §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss

exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that “This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission.” The requestor’s supplemental position statement asserts that:

“The medical records on file with MDR show this admission to be a complex spine surgery which is unusually extensive for at least two reasons; first, this type of surgery is unusually extensive when compared to all surgeries performed on workers’ compensation patients in that only 19% of such surgeries involved operations on the spine; second, this type of surgery requires additional, trained nursing staff and specialized equipment (such as the operating table) thereby making the hospital services unusually extensive. Finally, any evidence of comorbidities, which should be considered, is part of the medical records, which have been previously filed.”

The requestor’s categorization of spinal surgeries presupposes that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive for the specified reasons. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the reasons asserted, nor did the requestor point to any sources for the information presented. The reasons stated are therefore not demonstrated. Additionally, the requestor’s position that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive does not satisfy §134.401(c)(2)(C) which requires application of the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis. The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion affirmed this, stating “The rule further states that independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception will be ‘allowed on a case-by-case basis.’ *Id.* §134.401(c)(2)(C). This language suggests that the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases.” The requestor’s position that all spine surgeries are unusually extensive fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the particulars of the services in dispute are not discussed, nor does the requestor demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For the reasons stated, the division finds that the requestor failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually extensive.

4. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The requestor’s supplemental position statement asserts that:

“The medical and billing records on file with MDR also show that this admission was unusually costly for two reasons: first the median charge for all workers’ compensation inpatient surgeries is \$23,187; the median charge for workers’ compensation surgeries of this type is \$39,000; therefore the audited billed charges for this surgery substantially exceed not only the median charges, but also the \$40,000 stop-loss threshold; second, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in order for this surgery to be performed, specialized equipment and specially trained, extra nursing staff were required, thereby adding substantially to the cost of surgery in comparison to other types of surgeries; and third, it was necessary to purchase expensive implants for use in the surgery.”

The requestor asserts that because the **billed charges** exceed the stop-loss threshold, the admission in this case is unusually costly. The division notes that audited charges are addressed as a separate and distinct factor described in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i). Billed charges for services do not represent the cost of providing those services, and no such relation has been established in the instant case. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the **costs** associated with the services in dispute are unusual when compared to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For that reason, the division rejects the requestor’s position that the admission is unusually costly based on the mere fact that the billed or audited charges “substantially” exceed \$40,000. The requestor additionally asserts that certain resources that are used for the types of surgeries associated with the admission in dispute (i.e. specialized equipment and specially-trained, extra nursing staff) added substantially to the cost of the admission. The requestor does not list or quantify the costs associated with these resources in relation to the disputed services, nor does the requestor provide documentation to support a reasonable comparison between the resources required for the comparison surgeries. Therefore, the requestor fails to demonstrate that the hospital’s resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly when compared to the hospital’s resources used in other types of surgeries.

5. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

- Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission...” The length of stay was one days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of one days results in an allowable amount of \$1,118.00.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed 3 units of Thrombin USP TOP at \$346.60/unit, for a total charge of \$1,039.80. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for Thrombin USP TOP. For that reason, reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended
- The division notes that 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274).” Review of the requestor’s medical bills finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 0278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A) as follows:

Charge Code	Itemized Statement Description	Cost Invoice Description	UNITS / Cost Per Unit	Total Cost	Cost + 10%
0003130	Putty OP-1	Op-1 Putty	1 at \$5,250.00 ea	\$5,250.00	\$5,775.00
0002399	Cap Screw	Locking Screw Caps	6 at \$395.00 ea	\$2,370.00	\$2,607.00
0002419	Rod Spinal Solution	70 MM ROD	2 at \$395.00 ea	\$790.00	\$869.00
0002421	Screw Pedicle	6.5 X 40 Pedicle Screw	4 at \$1,295.00 ea	\$5,180.00	\$5,698.00
0002421	Screw Pedicle	6.5 X 35 MM Multi Axial	2 at \$1,295.00 ea	\$2,590.00	\$2,849.00
0002510	Cage Plif	12/14/12 X8X8X22 MM Plif Cage	2 at \$2,895.00 ea	\$5,790.00	\$6,369.00
TOTAL ALLOWABLE				\$24,167.00	

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$1,118.00 + 24,167.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$22,941.39. Based upon the documentation submitted, additional reimbursement in the amount of \$2,343.61 is recommended

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to

additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$2,343.61 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

Authorized Signature

_____	_____	9/18/12
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.